



Presupposition wipe-out can't be all or nothing: a note on conflicting presuppositions

Romoli, J. (Accepted/In press). Presupposition wipe-out can't be all or nothing: a note on conflicting presuppositions. *snippets*, 24, 11-12.

[Link to publication record in Ulster University Research Portal](#)

Published in:
snippets

Publication Status:
Accepted/In press: 10/10/2011

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via Ulster University's Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Ulster University's institutional repository that provides access to Ulster's research outputs. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact pure-support@ulster.ac.uk.

snippets

Issue 24

November 2011

Contents

1. Theresa Biberauer and Johan Oosthuizen. *More unbearably light elements? Silent verbs demanding overt complementizers in Afrikaans.*
2. Alex Drummond. *The ban on rightward P-stranding is a global constraint.*
3. Giorgio Magri. *The plurality inference of object mass nouns.*
4. Jacopo Romoli. *Presupposition wipe-out can't be all or nothing: a note on conflicting presuppositions.*
5. Philippe Schlenker. *Generalized bishop sentences.*
6. Carson Schütze. *There does not undergo predicate inversion.*
7. Michelle Sheehan. *A note on case assignment to CP.*
8. Gary Thoms. *P-stranding diagnoses A'-movement in tough constructions.*
9. Honglei Wang, David Potter and Masaya Yoshida. *Cross-conjunct binding in nominal gapping.*



4.

Jacopo Romoli – *Harvard University*

Presupposition wipe-out can't be all or nothing: a note on conflicting presuppositions

jromoli@fas.harvard.edu

It has been suggested that cases of conflicting presuppositions like (1) ‘may [...] be amenable to a treatment in terms of local accommodation’ (Heim, 1983:fn.5).

(1) Either John stopped smoking or he started smoking

I will focus on the lexical insertion of an \mathcal{A} -operator, generally regarded as a grammatical reformulation of the process of local accommodation (Beaver and Krahmer (2001:171). \mathcal{A} is used as a ‘presupposition wipe-out device’ in trivalent accounts of presuppositions (Peters 1979, Beaver and Krahmer 2001, Fox 2008 and George 2008). Beaver and Krahmer (2001) propose to handle cases like (1) by inserting \mathcal{A} in both disjuncts as in (3). I will show that there are cases in which this simple account does not work and needs to be amended somehow.

(2) φ $\mathcal{A}\varphi$
1 1
0 0
0

(3) Either \mathcal{A} [John stopped smoking] or \mathcal{A} [John started smoking]

Soames (1979, 1982) observes that other presuppositions, like the one of *too* in (4) below, can survive despite the fact that the conflicting ones are cancelled.

(4) Either Bill stopped smoking and received an award for that too, or Bill started smoking.

As Soames points out, cases like (4) are problematic for an approach to cases like (1) that assumes that disjunction can be a ‘plug’ in the sense of Karttunen (1973): the presupposition of *too* would be incorrectly cancelled. (4), on the other hand, is not a problem for an account in terms of \mathcal{A} because it can be analyzed along the lines of (5), where *too* isn’t in the scope of \mathcal{A} .

(5) Either [\mathcal{A} [Bill stopped smoking] and [received an award for that too]]
or [Bill started smoking]

However, the same kind of solution is not tenable for an example like (6), where we have two presuppositional triggers embedded under *stopped/started* – the triggers *being upset that* and *too*. In this example, the presuppositions coming from *being upset* and *too* – respectively, the presuppositions that John left the country and that somebody else left the country – survive and indeed seem to project as presuppositions, as (7) shows. These propositions do not seem to be mere entailments of (6). It is unclear how to give scope to \neg in examples like (6) so that it could cancel only the conflicting presuppositions.

(6) Either John stopped being upset that he left the country too, or John started being upset that he left the country too.

(7) If either [John stopped being upset that he left the country too] or [John started being upset that that he left the country too], he will let us know soon.

Summing up, the modified Soames cases above constitute a challenge for an account of cases of conflicting presuppositions in terms of the \neg -operator.

References

- Beaver, D. and E. Krahmer. (2001) “A partial account of presupposition projection.” *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*.
- Fox, D. (2008) “Two short notes on Schlenker’s theory of presupposition projection.” *Theoretical Linguistics* 34, 237–252.
- George, B. (2008) *Presupposition Repairs: a Static, Trivalent Approach to Predicting Projection*. Master’s thesis, UCLA.
- Heim, I. (1983) “On the projection problem for presuppositions,” in *Proceedings of WCCFL 2*, ed. D. P. Flickinger. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 114–125.
- Karttunen, L. (1973) “Presuppositions of compound sentences.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 169–193.
- Peters, S. (1979) “A truth-conditional formulation of Karttunen’s account of presupposition.” *Synthese* 40, 301–316.
- Soames, S. (1979) “A projection problem for speaker presuppositions.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 10, 623–666.
- Soames, S. (1982) “How presuppositions are inherited: a solution to the projection problem.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 13(3), 483–545.